

certainty of free competition in the future. Court approval of a final judgment requires a standard more flexible and less strict than the standard required for a finding of liability. "[A] proposed decree must be approved even if it falls short of the remedy the court would impose on its own, as long as it falls within the range of acceptability or is 'within the reaches of public interest.' (citations omitted)."³

VIII. Determinative Documents

In deciding to consent to the proposed Amended Final Judgment, the United States considered no documents that were determinative within the meaning of the APPA. Consequently, no such documents have been filed with this Competitive Impact Statement.

Dated: June 8, 1999.

Respectfully submitted,

Kent Brown, VA Bar #18300; Kenneth W. Gaul, D.C. Bar #415456; Weeun Wang; Sanford M. Adler; Jeremy W. Eisenberg; Richard Koffman; Melinda Foster; Jeremy Feinstein,

Attorneys, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Computers & Finance Section, Suite 9500, 600 E Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530, (202) 307-6200.

Certificate of Service

The undersigned certifies that she is a paralegal employed by the United States Department of Justice, and is a person of such age and discretion to be competent to serve papers. The undersigned further certifies that on June 8, 1999, she caused true copies of the

1. Amendments to Complaint (together with attached Exhibit)
2. Uncontested Motion to Substitute Amended Final Judgment (together with the attached Exhibit)
3. Competitive Impact Statement

to be served upon the person in the manner stated below:

Counsel for Computer Associates International, Inc. and PLATINUM technology International, Inc.—
Richard L. Rosen, Esq., Arnold & Porter, 555 12th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20004.

(by hand delivery)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Washington, DC, this 8th day of June 1999.

Joann Maguire.

[FR Doc. 99-15419 Filed 6-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

[OJP (OJJDP)-1236]

RIN 1121-ZB69

Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program

AGENCY: Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Justice.

ACTION: Notice of extension of the deadline for applying for discretionary competitive assistance for the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is extending the deadline for applications from State and local law enforcement agencies interested in participating in the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force (ICAC Task Force) Program. The ICAC Task Force Program encourages communities to develop regional multidisciplinary, multijurisdictional task forces to prevent, interdict, and investigate sexual exploitation offenses against children by offenders using online technology.

DATES: The new deadline for applications to be received is Monday, July 19, 1999. (The original deadline was June 21, 1999).

ADDRESSES: Interested applicants must obtain an application kit from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse at 800-638-8736. The application kit is also available at OJJDP's Web site at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org. Copies of the complete program announcement, which appeared in the **Federal Register** on May 7, 1999, 64 FR 24856, are also available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse and on OJJDP's Web site.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Medaris, ICAC Task Force Program Manager, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 202-616-8937. [This is not a toll-free number.]

Dated: June 14, 1999.

Shay Bilchik,

Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[FR Doc. 99-15456 Filed 6-16-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Petitions for Modification

The following parties have filed petitions to modify the application of mandatory safety standards under section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977.

1. Snyder Coal Company

[Docket No. M-1999-030-C]

Snyder Coal Company, 66 Snyder Lane, Hegins, Pennsylvania 17938 has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.360 (preshift examination) to its Rattling Run Slope (I.D. No. 36-08713) located in Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania. The petitioner requests a modification of the mandatory standard to permit: (i) An alternative method of examination and evaluation including a visual examination of each seal for physical damage from the slope gunboat during the preshift examination after an air quantity reading is taken just inby the intake portal; (ii) an additional air reading and gas test for methane, carbon dioxide and oxygen deficiency to be taken at the intake air split location(s) just off the slope in the gangway portion of the working section; and (iii) the examiner reading the air and gas test to record the date, time, his/her initials, and the results of the readings at these locations prior to anyone entering the mine. The petitioner states that regardless of conditions found at the section evaluation point, the slope will be traveled and physically examined in its entirety on a monthly basis with the dates, times, and initials placed at sufficient locations, the results of the examination will be maintained on the surface, and all hazards will be corrected prior to transporting personnel into the slope. The petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method would provide at least the same measure of protection as would the mandatory standard.

2. Snyder Coal Company

[Docket No. M-1999-031-C]

Snyder Coal Company, 66 Snyder Lane, Hegins, Pennsylvania 17938 has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.364(b)(1), (4)

³ *United States v. American Tel. and Tel. Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131, 150 (D.D.C. 1983), *aff'd sub nom. Maryland v. United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983) quoting *United States v. Gillette Co.*, supra, 406 F. Supp. at 716; *United States v. Alcan Aluminum, Ltd.*, 605 F. Supp. 619, 622 (W.D. Ky. 1985).